



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCXVI.

JULY, 1867.

- ART. I.—1. *Chapters on Language*. By the REV. FREDERIC W. FARRAR, M. A. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1865. 12mo.
2. *On the Origin of Language*. By HENSLEIGH WEDGWOOD. London: N. Trübner & Co. 1866. 12mo.
3. *An Essay on the Origin and Formation of the Romance Languages*. By the RT. HON. SIR GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS. Second Edition. London: Parker, Son, and Brown. 1862. 12mo.
4. *Sull' Origine della Lingua Italiana. Dissertazione di CESARE CANTÙ*. Napoli. 1865. 8vo.
5. *Saggio sui Dialecti Gallo-Italici*. Di B. BIONDELLI. Milano. 1853. 8vo.
6. *Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie inedite o rare dal Secolo XIII. al XIX*. Bologna. 1861–1866. 18mo. 76 numbers.
7. *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria*. Genova. 1858–1866. 4 vols. Royal 8vo.
8. *Documenti Inediti riguardanti le due Crociate di San Ludovico IX., Re di Francia*. Raccolti ed illustrati da LUIGI TOMMASO BELGRANO. Genova. 1859–1865. 8vo.
9. *Codice Diplomatico del Regno di Carlo I. e II. d' Angiò*. Raccolti ed annotati per GIUSEPPE DEL GIUDICE. Vol. I. Napoli. 1863. Folio.
10. *Pergamene, Codici e Fogli Cartacei di Arboréa*. Raccolti ed illustrati da PIETRO MARTINI. Cagliari. 1863–1866. Folio. 8 numbers.

11. *Collezione di Opere inedite o rare dei primi tre Secoli della Lingua, pubblicata per cura della Reale Commissione pe' Testi di Lingua nelle Provincie dell' Emilia.* Torino. 1861, 1862. 2 vols. 12mo.
12. *Collezione di Opere inedite o rare dei primi tre Secoli della Lingua, pubblicata per cura della Reale Commissione pe' Testi di Lingua nella Provincie dell' Emilia.* (Municipal Codes, Romances of Chivalry, Chronicles, &c.) Bologna. 1862–1866. Vols. I. to XII. 8vo.

To common apprehension the art of speaking seems to flow so naturally, or rather spontaneously, from the faculty of speech, that a large proportion, perhaps even a majority, of those who practise it are not conscious that it is an art at all. With them, even the special movements of the lips and tongue and epiglottis, of the larynx, the lungs, the thorax, of the thousand muscles, in short, concerned in the formation and modulation of articulate sounds, are as involuntary as the process of respiration, which is effected by a part of the same organs; speech is thinking aloud, and, like purely intellectual cogitation, devoid of consciously directed material action. Man must have passed out of the subjective stage of existence, acquired a certain amount of contemplative culture, of power of introspective observation,—he must have learned to project himself outwards as an object, and to make himself his own “proper study,”—before he is able to consider the character of language as an organic mechanism, and to inquire at what point in its processes instinct yields to invention and nature is merged in art.

And this is one of the many cases where the child is wiser than the man; for in the imitation of vocal sounds the infant evidently makes a voluntary effort of comparison and repetition, and deliberately experiments on the mode of producing articulations. But the sound once acquired, the process by which it was mastered is forgotten, and the adult cannot comprehend speech as an art until he has repeated the experiments of his infancy upon the utterance of vocal elements and syllables, and brought a self-intelligent will to bear upon the various movements of the organs employed in pronouncing them. This study requires an effort of attention and of volition analogous

to that by which we learn to control the action of the involuntary muscles ; for every involuntary muscle may become voluntary, or rather be made obedient to conscious will, — every voluntary muscle may come again to act, as all muscles primarily do, spontaneously, at least so far as we can detect any effort of the will to direct them. Many persons move freely the ears, the scalp, and other usually fixed portions of the body. There are well-attested instances of the power of accelerating or retarding the beating of the pulse at pleasure ; while, on the other hand, a rope-dancer, in his familiar feats, is as little conscious of the action of the will in his limbs as in his balancing-pole.

Persons who have never systematically studied the mechanism of their own speech doubtless often acquire the pronunciation of a foreign tongue with very little reflective, conscious effort ; but an educated man who tries to imitate the sounds of a language unknown to him, soon perceives that his ear must undergo a good deal of training before he can even truly hear those sounds, and that to produce them he must employ organs, or at least muscles, which are either not brought into play at all, or act in a different way, in the pronunciation of his native dialect.

The structure and movements of the various organs of articulation have been very carefully studied by physiologists and phonologists, and, by the aid of ingenious contrivances, made visible and capable of graphic representation. Philologists have detected laws of development and succession in articulation, so that from a given form of a word in a given age we can say with confidence what it must have been at an earlier, what it must become at a later period.

These observations, of course, apply exclusively to the material processes of speech. The sensuous mechanism, the natural history of audible language, is much better understood than its intellectual philosophy ; and the obscure question of the relation of vocal sounds to the objects, images, emotions, and thoughts expressed by them, or, in other words, of the origin of language, is as unsettled as it was in the days of Aristotle. Many new facts bearing on this point have indeed been discovered, and they all, or nearly all, tend in the same direction ; that is, to the imitative and the interjectional or ejaculative

theories, which seem to be necessarily complementary to each other. Farrar and Wedgwood, the ablest advocates of these theories who have written in English, perhaps the ablest who have discussed the subject at all, have made numerous converts; but their arguments are rejected as inconclusive by many of the most eminent linguists of our time, who, however, have as yet by no means refuted them, or suggested any more probable theory.

Among existing knowledges, the theory and laws of articulate speech, as systematized by Max Müller and other philologists in the form called — too ambitiously perhaps — the science of language, has been the last to undergo the process of exposition in untechnical phraseology, or what, in these days of levelling up, is known as popularization, but which, at that recent period when in Europe there was no people, but only kings, lords, priests, and varletry, was half contemptuously styled vulgarization. The lateness of the attempt to bring down to ordinary comprehension, and to make accessible to ordinary facilities of attainment, some acquaintance with the general facts — or laws, if that term be insisted on — which constitute the body of this science, is in a great degree due to the circumstance just alluded to, — that it is, perhaps, the knowledge the conscious application of whose principles is most remote from the uses and demands of ordinary life, and which leaves the faintest traces on the popular touchstone of “utility.”

We say the *conscious* application of principle; for through all this mysterious life of ours we are acting in obedience to rules of whose form, conditions, and limitations, nay, of whose very existence, we are ignorant. Every man speaks, and he may pronounce well, without any acquaintance with the muscular structure and peculiar functions of the individual organs of articulation, or with the theoretical analysis of vocal sounds; he may strictly conform to the idiom of his native tongue without knowing wherein that idiom corresponds to, and wherein it differs from, the philological system of other more or less closely related languages, without even being aware that words are susceptible of division into grammatical classes; he may use a compound word in exact accordance with the primary

senses of its remote radicals, without having heard that the term ever existed in any simpler or different form. Linguistic science is to the practical use of any given speech what the theory of statics is to walking. There were good pedestrians before it was observed that, when the body is advanced in the act of walking, the line of direction is thrown without the base, and hence every forward movement is the beginning of a fall, the whole process a series of incipient falls, each arrested by a step which serves, not to aid the progress, but only to extend the base of the ambulant machine, and thus avert the catastrophe.

But the science of statics has very palpable practical uses. Architects in all ages have doubtless often "builded better than they knew," but experience shows that they would have builded better still if they had known more of the scientific principles of stable construction; whereas it has not been observed that persons who occupy themselves with recondite grammatical theory and comparative philology write or speak more forcibly, more eloquently, or even more accurately than their neighbors, who are content with a knowledge of the positive facts which make up the inflexional, syntactical, and lexical system of their native speech.

But it is due to our intelligent nature and to the spirit of philosophical inquiry to say, that science is not, and never has been, cultivated chiefly for the sake of its material or practical ends; for though knowledge is power, it is far more emphatically pleasure. Minerva is worshipped rather for her beauty than for her strength. When a brilliant, imaginative theorist or a skilful experimenter has excited attention by a luminous exposition of newly suggested laws, or even of comprehensive facts based on yet unsuspected law, he is at once surrounded by eager disciples, who are attracted by that disinterested curiosity which is a natural impulse in every enlightened mind. The discoverer of a principle does not ordinarily invent a machine for its practical application. Even the inventor of the machine does not often reap the pecuniary reward; and the versatile Watt is almost the only recorded instance where the philosopher, the inventor, and the capitalist have been united in the same person.

Strictly speaking, the highest science must ever be the possession of the few, because few are gifted with a natural aptitude for the comprehension of philosophic principle, or even for the generalization of widely and variously applicable fact ; few enjoy the leisure, the opportunity, and the capacity for the persevering and continuous study which is required for the full mastery of any systematized body of unfamiliar truths. Slow, circumstantial, and laborious processes are still the only paths to the remotest limit accessible at a given period in any science. Scholars thus trained are apt to look with unjust disdain upon the attainments of those who have followed shorter avenues, — royal roads to the same apparent results, — because they hold that exact method and precise knowledge of minor detail, if not more valuable than the results themselves, are yet essential to a full comprehension of them. This is doubtless, in general, true, but it by no means follows that imperfect knowledge is worthless ; and the distinction in *kind*, supposed to exist between the science of the philosopher and the empiricism of the layman, is, in most cases, purely imaginary. Scientific men are perpetually confounding what they, above all others, ought clearly to distinguish, — law and fact ; and a majority of the propositions enunciated as laws in books of natural and even moral philosophy are barely generalizations of facts of observation, whose rationale is as completely unknown to the Newton as to the most ignorant peasant. The man of science knows more, but it is a mistake to suppose that, in regard to the mass of his attainments, he has an acquaintance with principles which enables him to know better than other men. His superiority consists, first, in a more orderly, or, if you please, philosophical arrangement ; and secondly, in a greater accumulation of observed facts. In material science, nothing is a law which is not demonstrably a necessary result of the constitution of matter and the notions of time and space. The number of such laws yet discovered and precisely formulated is extremely small, while that of general, and, so far as we know, even universal facts, is very great.

The science of language, so far as it is yet constituted, consists almost wholly of facts more or less general in their application, but not referable to any ascertained necessary law ; and

thus far our knowledge of it belongs rather to the domain of natural than to that of intellectual philosophy. The extension of the boundaries of this science has been greatly facilitated by foreign conquest, by commercial and missionary enterprise, by scientific travel ; but the most important contributions to our progress in it have come from a nation which has, until lately, least participated in these operations. It is to the philosophizing spirit of Germany that we directly or indirectly owe nearly all the advance we have made in recent times in the theoretical knowledge of speech ; and there are few European peoples who are not more indebted to German than to native scholarship for a better acquaintance with the special history and grammatical structure of their vernacular tongue. German philologists do not generally affect ease of method even to the extent of lightening the mere mechanical difficulties of acquiring foreign languages. In their grammars and linguistic treatises, little regard is paid to distinctness of typography, or to such a division of matter into chapter, section, and paragraph, such a conspicuous arrangement of important words as to catch the eye and facilitate the search for a particular passage or subject ; while indexes, and even full tables of contents, are very commonly dispensed with altogether.

Although, therefore, much has been done in Germany for the accumulation and organization of linguistic knowledge, and for its diffusion among professed scholars, the philosophy of language, as expounded in the literature of that country, has not been made either so accessible or so attractive in form as most other sciences.

It is, nevertheless, to a German scholar writing in English that we are indebted for by far the ablest and most successful attempts yet made for the popularization of the principles of linguistic science.

Modern philosophers do not assent to the doctrine of Socrates, that nothing can be known ; but they agree with him in holding, that, for the purpose of mental discipline, the search for knowledge is worth more than knowledge itself. Hence, they do not estimate didactic works simply by the amount of scientific fact, or even principle, which they reveal, but also by

the strength and vivacity of the stimulus they administer to the intellect, the impulse they give to the voluntary exercise of the mental powers. Considered from this point of view, the writings of Max Müller, and especially his "*Lectures on the Science of Language*," mark an epoch in the history of linguistic literature. With the exception of Lyell's "*Principles of Geology*," we are acquainted with no scientific work which has at once excited the interest of so numerous a class of intelligent readers,—none which, by stimulating enlightened curiosity, and by clear exposition of the objects and value of a particular study, has contributed so largely to advance the progress of the science whose cultivation it advocates. The two works resemble each other in the genial way in which they clothe with flesh the dry bones of scientific system, in a skilful use of every fact bearing upon those theories that modern research has discovered, and in a breadth of illustration which lays under contribution all collateral knowledges, and attracts the sympathy of every man of liberal culture by appealing to his speciality as, if not a formal ally, at least a kindred discipline. A scientific teacher, who has trained pupils in both continents, has often remarked, that if, in an audience of a hundred, he had secured two or three earnest hearers, the aim of his course was accomplished. Not every reader of Lyell's classic volume becomes a geologist, not every listener to Müller's learned and eloquent lectures becomes a linguist, but each of these philosophers has founded, or rather richly endowed, an English "school of the prophets," which will long rank among the most conspicuous foci of science.

In England, in France, and in all the Northern Continental nations, the study of comparative grammar has led to a more assiduous cultivation of domestic philology. The etymology, the inflexional system, and the syntax of the languages of those countries have received much elucidation, both from sources considered, not long since, unrelated to all of them, and from the detection of latent affinities between them, which often vividly illustrate obscure points in their significance and history. Without inquiring how far the revived spirit of nationality—which is one of the most characteristic features of the associate life of our times—is the cause or the conse-

quence of the advancement of linguistic and philological knowledge, it is certain that patriotism and philology have reciprocally promoted each other. For investigation into ancient domestic history, which always accompanies the awakening of a new consciousness of national life, an acquaintance with the often half-forgotten dialects in which the local annals are embodied is indispensable. The best materials for the study of these older forms of speech are to be found in ancient laws, contracts, letters, family memorials, and historic ballads, the study of which rarely fails to rekindle patriotic enthusiasm.

But man is not a ruminating animal. Nations cannot live wholly on the past. The original modern authorship which the pursuit of mediæval literature has prompted in Northern and Central Europe often borrows its themes from ancient national story, — its illustrations, and in part even its diction, from reminiscences of ancestral life, — and is more or less inspired by a breath of resuscitated animation; but it is nevertheless fresh, vivacious, and progressive in spirit.

It is only in an inferior degree that corresponding results have yet manifested themselves in the imaginative, the historical, or the philological literature of Southern Europe. The lips of no modern Italian bard have been touched by that coal from the altar which kindled the prophetic fire in Whittier's heart when he chanted his noblest lay, "The Reformer." The "backward-looking son" of the Latin family has not yet sufficiently learned that the "waster is the builder too." Ghostly conservatisms haunt his imagination; and even after his eyes are opened to the hopes of the inevitable future, he still pays a languid worship at the shrine of "Pazienza." The movement with which those races are heaving even now, in these days of change, bears more the aspect of a contagious excitement, than of the spontaneous development of a new organic life. In Italy, especially, the influence of France — we are not speaking of the political relations between the two countries, nor of the special character of that influence, for *any* controlling foreign ascendancy must always be fatal to the originality and intellectual growth of a people — is smothering what might else become a new and higher form of Latin nationality. Italy has yet scarcely reflected back a single wave

of the impulse it has received in so many directions from without, and has contributed little or nothing to accelerate the action of the ferment which is leavening the whole earth. There is nothing which can fairly be called a modern school of Italian literature, and but one Italian creative spirit — Manzoni — has acquired a European celebrity in the present century. But Manzoni is not of this age; he belongs rather to the period in which he has laid the scene of his admirable romance. Nicolini, superior to Manzoni in enlightened patriotism and political wisdom, though much inferior in genius, is less remarkable for poetic inspiration and originality of thought than for a clearness of vision which enabled him to see, and a moral courage which emboldened him to utter, truths that few Italian poets have felt, or dared to speak, for centuries. Giusti, the Tuscan satirist and lyrist, emphatically the prophet, the *vates sacer*, of modern Italy, is, with the exception of Manzoni, and perhaps Leopardi, the only Italian writer of this century whose works are pervaded with that ambrosial flavor of immortality which gives assurance of perpetual life. Leopardi was an eminent philologist; and both Manzoni and Giusti, though not apparently men of much linguistic learning, were most critical students of their own tongue. Giusti's dialect, in fact, is so strictly national, or, to speak more accurately, provincial, that even Italian strangers, Lombards, Venetians, and Piedmontese, find in him many dark sayings hard to be understood, and his familiar letters are published with explanatory notes, for the benefit of *non-Toscani*.

In the general cultivation of the science of language, the Italians have been behind most other European nations. They have had, and still have, men distinguished by linguistic attainment, eminent Egyptologists, as well as Semitic and Sanscrit scholars; but since the creation of the modern school of philology, they have contributed comparatively little to the furtherance of this branch of knowledge. The old Italic languages, as well as the early history of Rome, have been more thoroughly studied and more ably elucidated by foreign than by native scholars; and the modern Italian and other Romance dialects have by no means received from those who speak them the attention which they merit, both by their intrinsic interest and by their relative importance in the history of speech.

Indeed, we think that the linguistic character of the mediæval Romance dialects has been generally somewhat mistaken, and their value as sources of linguistic instruction, though pointed out by Max Müller, has been popularly much underrated. It is too commonly assumed that they were speeches exclusively in a state of analysis, resolution, and decay. The fact that the *Bildungstrieb*, the *nisus formativus*, and even the synthetic tendency were in them, as in some of the Gothic tongues, always at work, has certainly not been wholly overlooked; but the importance of this fact, as suggesting illustrations of the processes by which inflexions were built up in the early stages of speech, has scarcely been fully recognized, except by the great linguist to whom we have just referred.

To an Italian there is apparently no riddle to solve in the affinity between the Latin and his mother tongue, and the very obviousness of a general relation between them is calculated rather to damp than to pique curiosity as to the precise character of that relation. The natural impulse of a classical scholar — and all Italians who are educated at all know Latin — is to regard all the modern Romance dialects alike as the degenerate progeny of a noble speech, and therefore as possessing no history worthy of attention. To this day Italy has no better grammar of her native speech than the old-world *Regole* of Corticelli, published two hundred years ago; no parallel grammar of Latin and Italian; no etymologicon comparable to that of Diez, or even Ménage. The same observations apply, substantially, to the other Romance nations, not, however, including the French, which has too large an infusion of Gothic and Celtic elements to be considered as belonging essentially to the Latin race. The Spanish and Portuguese languages are, very probably, even more closely allied to classical Latin than is the Italian; but the contributions of Hispanic scholars to our knowledge of the relations between the old speech and the new, and to the special biography of their native dialects, are almost insignificant.

But, notwithstanding the general disinclination of these races to the pursuit of linguistic science, and particularly to really thorough and philosophical research into the primary history of the Romance languages, Italian philologists of for-

mer centuries have collected much material for the elucidation of the subject, and we are now at the opening of an era which promises the creation of a new and truly national school of Italian art, literature, and philosophy, as well as of civil and ecclesiastical polity. While Italy was “but a geographical expression,” the Tuscan dialect was the common — that is, *public*, not *familiar* — language of the provinces. It is now the national tongue. It promises to become the universal popular speech. It is fast ridding itself of cumbrous forms and involutions, and adapting its movements to the new uses and exigencies of modern political and social life. A large and liberal patriotism is supplanting the old municipalism, and that which is common to all is assuming a higher place in the affections of the Italian citizen than that which is the possession of but a few. Native philology will absorb a larger share of attention, and there will be a natural impulse to connect, by historical research, the breathing speech of the hour with the living tongue, not the dead literature, of ancient Rome.

The Italians have long been stigmatized — and by none more severely than by their own writers — as a characterless race. And yet few European nations have produced within the last half-century more men of iron will and exhaustless energy. None can boast nobler examples of lofty patriotism, self-sacrificing devotion, and the humbler virtues, than Italy. The quality of physical bravery has been largely developed in recent years, not only in men in conspicuous and responsible positions, but in the masses. Moral courage is usually evolved later in the formation of a great national type, and this essential constituent of every virtue, hitherto a comparatively rare trait among the Italians, is beginning to take the place of the hesitancy, doubt, and indecision formerly characteristic of the people. All the grand characters of modern Italy — Europe has no more truly heroic names than Ricasoli and Garibaldi — have been tempered in the fires of that broad national patriotism which the hope of national unity has made possible, and the new government has no special policy which is not dictated and improved purely by the patriotic idea. Cantù sighs over the “war which the Reformation waged against Latin,” and pays a noble, though unconscious tribute

to the spirit of that great movement, by identifying its cause with that of the enlivening element of modern political progress, and sneering at the narrow patriotism which “translated the Bible into the vernacular tongues with the purpose of substituting the idea of nationality for the grand catholic unity of the Middle Ages,” — a unity which apotheosized pontiffs and princes, but did nothing to inculcate Christian brotherhood, nothing to promote international and domestic peace, nothing to diffuse popular intelligence or to promote the practice of the social virtues. Before his ink is fairly dry, the Italian government declares its adhesion to the “idea of nationality” by the most radical course of policy, — independence of Rome, absolute divorce of Church and State, and the suppression of the monasteries, which are at once sinks of ignorance and vice, and strongholds of a hostile power within the boundaries of the state.

While doting Rome is fumbling over the old Jesuit “Relations” to find new “Japanese martyrs” to canonize, new idols for popular superstition to worship, Italy is raising monuments to the “Martiri della Libertà Italiana,” and giving honorable sepulture to the bones of the brothers Bandiera, whom the British Postmaster-General, Sir James Graham, betrayed to the Neapolitan executioner. Literary associations and private publishers are printing hitherto inedited manuscripts, or reproducing rare early editions. The government is doing something to encourage historical and literary research, and aiding in the publication of the results, and a great number of volumes of more or less valuable philological material have already been issued from the press. Most of them, it is true, date from too late a period to throw much light on the primitive history of the modern Peninsular speech. Some of the more ostentatious of these publications are but monuments of pompous inanity; and the editors of some are aping the silly exclusiveness of English and French bibliomaniac clubbists, in limiting the impressions to a very small number of copies, and thus giving the factitious value of rarity to much that has no intrinsic worth. Others, of less pretension, — and we take pleasure in particularizing among them the *Documenti Inediti riguardanti le due Crociate di San Ludovico IX.*, now publishing at Genoa

in a modest octavo,—are of much philological as well as historical interest. The *Collezioni di Opere inedite o rare*, edited by the Commissione pe' Testi di Lingua, forms an auspicious commencement of what promises to compose a very valuable repository. A new series of the *Archivio Storico* has been commenced at Florence, and there is evidently a progress in the right direction. Biondelli, in the course of his studies on the Italian local dialects, has revealed many interesting facts, pointed out suggestive analogies, and furnished a very considerable amount of useful data for further scientific elaboration. The political and ecclesiastical archives of the Middle Ages in the kingdom of Italy being now open to free research, we may soon expect new and valuable accessions to our historical and philological knowledge of those eras. The records of Papal Rome still remain closed to profane eyes. "Priestcraft never owns its juggles," and therefore the secrets of the *Curia Romana* will never be voluntarily confessed by its members. But Rome cannot long resist the pressure from without, and light will soon penetrate to the foulest corners and darkest recesses of the pontifical palace. Some, at least, of Giusti's visions in *Prete Pero* will be realized. APPIGIONASI will be written on the walls of the Vatican; and then whatever priestly jealousy shall have spared of the documentary matter accumulated in its vaults will become available both for the warning and the instruction of men. Even the plundering and sale of manuscripts from the conventual libraries, which is now going on in Italy, will serve to bring to light some valuable historical and literary facts, and to rescue from annihilation memorials which the monks would have destroyed if they had not been allowed, by the indulgence of the government, an opportunity of stealing them.

In instituting a parallel between the classical Latin and the modern Romance dialects, we possess an advantage which does not exist for similar comparison between older and more recent forms of the Gothic tongues. We have the Latin, not indeed in a very primitive, not even in its earliest written form, but we know it as it was in its most advanced stage of grammatical development, in its highest literary culture, in all its catholic variety of application. The wealth and multifari-

ousness of extant classical literature has preserved to us, in all probability, a very large proportion of its authorized vocabulary, exemplifications of all its grammatical forms, and of most of its phraseological combinations. In other words, we have the lexical, inflexional, syntactical, and rhetorical systems complete. Hence we may claim to be acquainted with Latin in its utmost capacity, its widest versatility of expression. Besides this, the language has continued, through all the fluctuations of Italian history down to the present day, if not a vernacular, yet what may be called, without a great departure from propriety of speech, a living tongue, and thus we have the means of studying its whole power of accommodation to new ideas, new facts, new uses, and, in fine, the entire range of the analogies and the discrepancies between it and the modern dialects of the Latin races.

On the other hand, our oldest memorials of a Gothic speech, except a few isolated words, chiefly proper names, date from the fourth century after Christ. These consist of a large part of the New, and insignificant fragments of the Old Testament, a part of a commentary on the Gospel of John, and a few mere scraps of calendars and private contracts, in the Mæso-Gothic language, — a dialect of the Low German family, which has utterly perished, leaving no progeny, no later phase; for, in the opinion of the ablest German philologists, none of the many modern Teutonic dialects can claim to be descended from the Mæso-Gothic; hence it is an isolated philological organism, having collateral relatives indeed, but, so far as we know, neither progenitors nor posterity. After Ulfilas, four centuries elapsed before a Continental Germanic tongue became the vehicle of a literature. From the ninth century, we have important remains, and thenceforward a nearly continuous succession of literary memorials, in various dialects, until the sixteenth century. At this period, the High-German, in substantially its present form, supplanted all the rest, and became the exclusive cultivated tongue of the Germanic nations, unless we include in this appellation the Netherlanders, who write and speak a language nearly allied to the Platt-Deutsch or Low-German dialects. The Anglo-Saxon, which was transported to England with the conquerors in the fifth century, appears to have had

a literature at an earlier period than any of the sister dialects except the Mæso-Gothic, and it is probable that "Beowulf" existed, at least orally, before the Anglo-Saxon invasion. But we do not know this poem in its primitive recension; and, philologically speaking, we cannot assign to it an earlier date than that of the only manuscript which appears to belong to the eighth century.*

With the exception of this Christian *rifacimento* of a heathen poem or saga, which has doubtless undergone as great grammatical as literary modifications, all the oldest Germanic literature we are acquainted with consists of versions or paraphrases of Scripture. There is good reason to believe that, partly from the want of existing examples of composition in the native speech, partly from inexperience in translation, and partly from a desire to secure a strict conformity to the sacred text, the construction and syntax of these monuments were, in a considerable degree, fashioned after those of the Greek and Latin originals. These writings, revered as the earliest literary monuments of the speech, and at the same time as the voice of an infallible revelation, became authoritative models to later authors, and consequently a foreign type was impressed upon Germanic philology in the very cradle of its literature. Hence, as literary mediums, the Teutonic dialects are not self-developed, and there is in many cases room for doubt whether a given construction is indigenous or borrowed from an extraneous source. Besides this, the extant remains of this ancient literature are not sufficiently extensive, or various enough in subject, to have employed more than a small proportion of the vocabulary or of the syntactical and rhetorical combinations of any of the Teutonic languages. Our knowledge of these dialects is therefore necessarily very imperfect, and we are far less acquainted with the primitive sources of our own every-day vernacular, or even with the native character of the Germanic dialects a thousand years ago, than we are with the minutiae of

* The traces of Christianity in Beowulf are probably "improvements" of the original by copyists and editors. It has been argued, from the coincidence of a few names of places, that Beowulf was composed in England. Is it not equally probable that names taken from the localities referred to in the poem were bestowed upon English sites by the Anglo-Saxon immigrants?

the philology of alien Rome ten centuries earlier. The Germanic tongues, then, want what the Romance possess,—a central representative, a great common, authoritative, copious, ancient, and unchangeable standard of comparison and typical example.

Nor is this all. We do not know in what stage of their history the Mæso-Gothic or other Germanic dialects were reduced to writing and became mediums of literary effort. We are unable even to say whether they had attained to the ultimatum of grammatical improvement which the genius of the Gothic family of speech admitted, or whether they had reached that point and again receded from it; in short, whether they were in process of construction or of resolution. Unwritten tongues are much less stable in their forms than the dialects of literature. So far as we know them, they tend to composition, agglutination, multiplication, and discrimination of inflexions, especially in the verbs. But to this there must be a limit; and when grammatical refinement has been carried as far as it can go, it is natural that the rigorous observance of its rules should be relaxed, and a reactionary, analytic tendency should manifest itself. As soon as a speech which has lived only in the mouths of a people becomes a written language and possesses a literature, its grammatical progress, its power of self-evolution, is greatly checked, if not completely paralyzed. The formation of a new inflexion in a written dialect, though certainly not impossible, is rare; and letters are equally effectual in retarding the decay of an established grammatical system. In either case, the vocabulary may still increase by importation from abroad, and even by organic derivation and composition; but with respect to the characteristic forms of speech, the legislation of Cadmus is almost as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians. The accidence and syntax, once recorded in visible symbols, are substantially unchangeable. Whether it is an evil to a language simply as a literary medium to become thus petrified before or some time after it arrives at its highest possible point of grammatical constructiveness, is a question on which opinions may differ; but as a philological study, the more perfected its mechanism, the more instructive it is. Thus the formal apparatus of the Greek language, which

was arrested in its movement by the introduction of the alphabet when it had either not reached or already passed its structural meridian, is much less valuable as a linguistic discipline than that of the Latin, — *teres atque rotunda*, — whose literature commences with the culmination of its grammar.

We have observed that most of the recently published monuments of mediæval Italian literature date from too recent an era to be of much value in illustrating the early history of the modern Italian dialects. The series of documents now in course of publication under the title of *Pergamene, Codici e Fogli Cartacei di Arboréa*, is an exception to this remark ; and if the genuineness of the writings embraced in the collection be established, it forms an important contribution to our materials for investigating the true relation between classical Latin and at least one modern Romance dialect. The *Carte di Arboréa* consist of eight manuscripts, one of which is described as a palimpsest, on parchment, and fifteen on paper, besides twelve letters and other smaller writings of a more or less fragmentary character, also on paper. They are classed by the editor as Latin, Sardinian, Italian, and Catalan ; and with the exception of a poem of sixteen verses stated to be of the time of Diocletian, their dates range from the seventh to the fifteenth century. Some of them are in prose, some in verse, and they relate almost exclusively to the history of the island of Sardinia. Although it is twenty years since the attention of Italian *literati* was called to these manuscripts, they do not appear to have been subjected to critical examination by any scholar known to the world as competent to pronounce an authoritative opinion on their authenticity, nor indeed have they excited much interest anywhere out of Sardinia. The external evidence in support of their genuineness is very unsatisfactory, or rather it may be said there is next to no evidence at all on the subject. They have been produced piecemeal, from time to time since the year 1845, by an ex-monk residing at Cagliari, and sold to different persons, who have presented them to the library of the University of that city. The vendor stated that one of them was discovered among the papers of his family, and that the remainder came from Oristano in the province of Arboréa ; but he gave no information respecting the source from

which they were received. Those who believe the manuscripts to be spurious ascribe the authorship of them to the reverend gentleman himself, — a theory certainly creditable to his learning and ingenuity. Those who accept them as authentic more charitably suppose that he came into possession of them by means of that “odd and secret” Lacedæmonian accomplishment which the judicious Scriblerus was careful to teach his son; in short, that, instead of forging the manuscripts, he only stole them, — the latter offence being esteemed a venial peccadillo in comparison with the former, which has become doubly disreputable since the unfortunate experiments of the learned Vella. Mediæval scholars are divided in regard to the weight of the *diplomatic* or paleographical evidence. This is a question not within our competence; but if we may be permitted to speak on so delicate a point of criticism as this, we should say that we do not discover any such discrepancy between the chirography of several of these manuscripts as to convince us that it is impossible they should be the work of one pen. On the contrary, we seem to discover a suspicious resemblance between the handwriting of monuments professedly executed in different centuries. Sardinian archæologists, who ought to be the best judges on this point, find the internal evidence, both historical and philological, strong in favor of the genuineness of the documents. Previously announced topographical and historical theories have, as is alleged, received striking confirmation from them; and, on the other hand, many new facts revealed by them have been established by recent researches in archives and other repositories of mediæval lore which could not have been accessible to the supposed counterfeiter. Coincidences of both these classes are said to be too numerous to admit of any probable explanation, except the simple theory that the papers are *bonâ fide* works of the ages and the authorship to which they lay claim. The only one of these documents respecting which the present writer would venture to speak with any confidence, upon a cursory examination, is a letter in the Catalan dialect, bearing date at Sassari on the 28th of February, 1497, enclosing copies of ancient inscriptions existing at Sassari, with drawings of Egyptian antiquities, and a summary of the contents of various Greek and Latin poems inscribed upon the

walls of a large subterranean tomb at Torres. The tone of this letter is altogether so modern that it is difficult to believe that it belongs to the fifteenth century ; and there occur in it grammatical constructions which may possibly be characteristic of a local dialect, but which we have not met with elsewhere in a pretty extensive study of Catalan prose literature. Upon the whole, we do not think that the genuineness of the *Carte di Arboréa*, though an article of faith with all patriotic Sardinians, is yet sufficiently made out to entitle them to rank as philological authorities.

Besides these various collections of material for illustrating the history of the native language and literature, the awakening interest of Italian scholars in domestic philology has produced some original works in that department which deserve more than a passing remark. We shall devote the remainder of this article to a notice of one of them, and of the theories it discusses.

In 1864, the Accademia Pontoniana of Naples propounded the following queries as a theme for a prize essay : “ What credit are we to allow to the proposition, that Italian is only a corruption of Latin ? The essential difference between the two languages. Admitting that Italian is a kind of degenerate Latin, how was the transformation brought about ? In fine, what shall we say of the opinion which maintains that Italian was spoken at Rome even while Latin was still a living tongue ? All which questions, being first examined, fix the true sources of the Italian language ; say whether it is the exclusive patrimony of a single province of the Peninsula ; and how far the other provinces, especially those of the South, may claim to possess it.”

The successful competitor for the prize was Cesare Cantù, who is well known as a voluminous and popular historical writer, and as a conspicuous disciple of one of the sects into which the new Catholic school has already divided itself. Both as a thinker and as an investigator, Cantù is less able and enlightened, we fear we must add less conscientious, than Montalembert. He was educated for the Church, if not actually professed ; and though now in secular life, he has never been able so to fold his turban as to hide the tonsure. He

professes toleration, but his notion of religious liberty is a parody of the political liberty of modern imperialism. "The ballot is perfectly free," said a French colonel to his soldiers; "but every man who does not vote for the First Consul shall be shot at the head of the regiment to-morrow morning." Full liberty of opinion and of speech shall be granted to the people when they heartily adopt the views of the Cæsar. Men who accept without question all the doctrines of the Church shall enjoy entire freedom of religious opinion. The historical reasoning of Cantù is generally of the hysteron-proteron order, even when it is not a begging of the question; but as the interests of the Papacy are not visibly compromised by any supposable decision of the problems raised by the Accademia Pontoniana, he has discussed them in a tone of independence and impartiality not usual with him.

In the preliminary part of his essay, — which is entitled *Dissertazione sull' Origine della Lingua Italiana*, — our author states that "there are three conflicting opinions in respect to the origin of the Italian language. First, that through the irruption of the Barbarians the Latin was changed, both lexically and grammatically, to such an extent as to become a new language, which is the modern Italian. This is the system of Castelvetro, Muratori, Raynouard, and finally of the great philologist, Max Müller. Second, that the present language of the Peninsula is the Latin transformed by the influence of the indigenous dialects of the provinces, into which it was introduced by conquest, — an opinion maintained by Fauriel," — a doctrine, it may be observed, which would apply with equal reason, *mutatis mutandis*, to the other Romance tongues. "Third, that Italian is the ancient Latin vernacular, not changed in substance or in nature, but simply modified by time and accident. This view has lately been espoused by Fuchs, and, to a certain extent, by Littré, who recognizes in the Neo-Latin tongues the essence of the actual speech of ancient Rome, affected by Germanic influence." (pp. 1, 2.)

The proposition which Cantù undertakes to maintain is, "that Italian is only the naturally modified speech of ancient Latium; so that the law of continuity, established by Liebnitz in physics, has been verified in that language; that no solution

of continuity was produced by sudden revolutions, but that successive evolutions reduced the spoken Latin to the modern dialect, — evolutions conformable to the usual methods by which the human spirit creates, wears out, transforms speech, and therefore similar to the organic processes of other languages.” (p. 2.) As Müller has complained that his views on the question under consideration have been misapprehended by Littré, and as the authority of both philologists is eminently entitled to respect, it is just to state their conclusions in words in which the former has quoted and adopted the opinions of the latter.

“I take this opportunity of stating that I never held the opinion ascribed to me by M. Littré (*Journal des Savants*, Avril, 1856; *Histoire de la Langue Française*, 1863, Vol. I. p. 94), with regard to the origin of the Romance languages. My object was to explain certain features of these languages, which I hold would be inexplicable if we looked upon French, Italian, and Spanish merely as secondary developments of Latin. They must be explained, as I tried to show, by the fact that the people in whose minds and mouths these modern dialects grew up were not all Romans or Roman provincials, but tribes thinking in German and trying to express themselves in Latin. It was this additional disturbing agency to which I endeavored to call attention, without for a moment wishing to deny other more normal and generally admitted agencies which were at work in the formation of the Neo-Latin dialects, as much as in all other languages advancing from what has been called a synthetic to an analytic state of grammar. In trying to place this special agency in its proper light, I may have expressed myself somewhat incautiously; but if I had to express again my own view on the origin of the Romance languages, I could not do it more clearly and accurately than in adopting the words of my eminent critic: ‘À mon tour, venant, par la série de ces études, à m’occuper du débat ouvert, j’y prends une position intermédiaire, pensant que, essentiellement, c’est la tradition latine qui domine dans les langues romanes, mais que l’invasion germanique leur a porté un rude coup, et que de ce conflit où elles ont failli succomber, et avec elles la civilisation, il leur est resté des cicatrices encore apparentes et qui sont, à un certain point de vue ces nuances germaniques signalées par Max Müller.’” — *Lectures on the Science of Language*, 2d Series, pp. 275, 276, note.

The difference between the theory of Müller and Littré and that of Cantù may be thus stated. Müller and Littré suppose the classical Latin in its incorrect popular form to be the basis

of all the Romance languages, and they ascribe the general departure of those languages from the Latin type to the disturbing influence of the Germanic element. Cantù makes an old unwritten vernacular dialect the basis of modern Italian, and denies to the Gothic invasion any specific transforming action distinct in kind or energy from that to which all languages are exposed in the vicissitudes of time and social revolution. To express the distinction more succinctly, and perhaps at the same time more precisely, we may say that Müller and Littré hold the Romance dialects, Italian included, to have been abnormally developed from classical Latin as popularly spoken under determining Germanic influences ; Cantù regards Italian, at least, as normally developed from the *lingua rustica*, or vernacular dialect of ancient Latium.

Upon general considerations, and without testing the applicability of the Müller-Littré theory to this or that particular Romance language, it is not clear that we may not discriminate between them, and admit in one case a controlling influence which we deny to have been exerted in another ; for thus far, *non constat* that the effects are so nearly identical that they must of necessity be referred to a common cause. Evidence which shows that in the classical ages there existed in Italy an unwritten dialect much resembling the modern Italian, would by no means prove that such dialect ever became current in Spain or in Gaul. There is a certain probability to the contrary. Colonists do not carry their popular dialects with them. We have substantially but one form of English — the grammatical language, the *lingua comune* — in the United States, and even in all the British American provinces. Castilian is the only dialect of Spanish known in all Spanish America. There is no presumption, therefore, that the *lingua rustica* ever extended itself beyond the bounds of Italy ; and the invasion of the Barbarians may have found in the Hispanic and Gallic provinces a material to work upon very different from that which it encountered in the popular speech of Italy.

This view of the subject makes it important to observe that, in the passage we have quoted, which — being, we believe, Müller's latest statement of his opinions — must be considered as embodying his maturest conclusions, he has not expressed

himself on one point with his usual clearness and precision. "The people in whose minds and mouths these modern dialects grew up were not *all* Romans or Roman provincials, but tribes thinking in German and trying to express themselves in Latin." We italicise *all* in order to draw attention to the discrepancy between the first and last member of this proposition. Now, what is Müller's idea of the ethnological condition of the "people" in question? Was the relative numerical importance of the native and the foreign element much the same in all the territory which had been occupied by the Latin race? Did the invaders constitute everywhere, or even anywhere, an actual majority of the population? And how far can we detect, in the written or the vulgar local dialects of these countries, differences fairly ascribable to a larger or smaller infusion of the foreign element? The importance of these questions, otherwise sufficiently obvious, specially appears from an interesting fact noticed by Cantù: "Venetia was never invaded by any barbarians. Verona, by all; but their dialects resemble each other much more than the Veronese does that of contiguous Brescia, the Brescian that of Bergamo, or the Bergamask that of Milan, — all territories barely separated by small streams. In like manner, only a river-course or a mountain ridge divides two languages so very diverse as Tuscan and Bolognese." In a note to this passage, Cantù states the following general objections to Müller's theory; and we think it will be admitted that, though by no means a decisive refutation, they are entitled to consideration: —

"1. The Germans were few in number as compared with the Italians; for otherwise their native land would have been depopulated, and they would have introduced their vernacular language into their new home.

"2. Allowing for the introduction of a few new words, and the impoverishment of grammatical forms, the Italian language, or (not to assume the point under discussion) the mediæval Latin, resembles the Latin, while it varies very widely from the German in both words and construction.

"3. The resemblance increases as we go backwards, that is, to the period of the invasion; whereas, the fact would be the contrary, if the invaders had introduced the new dialect.

“4. The Latin accent is generally retained in Italian, and we have nothing of the German rule which attaches the accent to the root, both in derivative and in compound words. This is a change which would naturally have taken place, if Latin had been essentially modified by the speech of the Germans.” (p. 76.)

The influence of immigration upon languages brought into contact by it may perhaps receive some illustration from what is going on among the German settlers in the United States, who often long remain together in considerable bodies, retaining for many years, more or less exclusively, the use of their native tongue. This is a too interesting and suggestive subject to be quite disregarded as a source of instruction in the study of the present question. We have not the materials for discussing it. We may, however, remark, that the old German immigrants in Pennsylvania, who have continued to use that language for a century in the midst of a nation English by birth and vernacular, have, in “trying to express themselves” in English, very little affected the dialect of their neighbors, or even carried into their own use of a new language many of the characteristic features of the old. On the contrary, you will hear, in the German of that population, many English words and idioms, while their English and that of their neighbors has no German ingredients, except now and then a single word or two, as, for example, *through-other*, corresponding to the German *durch-einander*, and the like.

In the discussion of his theme, Cantù makes little parade of linguistic knowledge, nor has he collected many new facts bearing upon the subject; but he had, on more than one former occasion, more or less fully examined the question, and he appears to be acquainted with nearly all the data and arguments which have been adduced by other writers in support or in refutation of the views he espouses. It was impossible, within the limits of an academic memoir of less than two hundred octavo pages, to give an exhaustive sifting of the principal problem and the many collateral questions which are suggested in considering it. The reader will not find in the paper any satisfactory solution of the doubts he may have entertained as to the coexistence and specific character of numerous local dialects in Roman

Italy, or, in other words, as to the question how far the *lingua rustica* was one or many,—any instructive inquiry in what way and to what extent the popular speech of the Peninsula was affected by irruptions of other than Germanic barbarians, or by the military colonies of foreign non-Germanic veterans established in Italy,—any probable explanation of lexical and grammatical coincidences between all the Romance languages, and which cannot be traced either to German or to ancient Latin, classical or rustic. But, with all these deductions, it must be admitted that our author has accomplished nearly all that could be effected in so brief a memoir. This essay may be pronounced a learned and able investigation of the historical relations of the Italian language, in its spoken and in its written forms, to the literary and the rustic Latin dialects of the classic ages. It is not only the most valuable contribution yet made by an Italian scholar to the primitive history of his native speech, but on the whole, as an argument, more satisfactory than anything known to us on the same subject from a foreign pen.

The theory of Cantù involves, or rather consists, of two minor propositions, the burden of the proof of which lies on the affirmant: first, that there existed in the classic period a *lingua rustica* grammatically, if not logically, so distinct from the written language, that it deserved to be regarded, not as merely a congeries of variable vulgar corruptions, but as a different dialect, though collaterally connected with Latin; second, that this *lingua rustica* still survives in, and is substantially identical with, one or more of the modern Italian dialects.

The notices of the ancient rustic or vulgar speech are so few and so scanty in the Latin authors whose works are embraced in our collegiate curriculum, or in the ordinary reading of American scholars, that the propositions we have just enunciated will strike most of our readers, perhaps, as little better than mere conjectures, improbable in themselves and almost wholly unsupported by historical testimony. Those, too, who have looked into the somewhat unfamiliar literature of this subject may have been confirmed in this opinion by the authority of the late lamented Sir George Cornewall Lewis, who characterizes as “absurd” the “fancy that the Romance or the Italian

existed as the language of the lower orders of ancient Italy in a shape little different from that which they bore in the thirteenth century," and who observes elsewhere, that "there appears to be no evidence whatever for the opinion that the *Romana rustica*, or *vulgaris*, was a language distinct in its forms or roots from the Latin, and spoken by the lower class or the peasants of Italy ; still less is there any proof that this language was the base of the Italian." It cannot be *absurd* to suppose that what happens to-day, in a particular family of languages, under given conditions, may have happened in the same family centuries ago under similar conditions. Now, by the side of the *lingua comune*, the written dialect of Italy, there exist spoken dialects "distinct" from the written speech "in forms" and often in "roots," and bearing the same relation to the *lingua comune* which Cantù supposes to have existed between the *lingua rustica* and the literary language of ancient Rome. Further, the Italian *lingua comune* demonstrably possessed, at least six hundred years ago, when it assumed a written form, very nearly the same grammar and the same vocabulary which it possesses at this day ; and there existed several other Italian dialects, which, as we have reason to believe, though less fixed than the literary language, or Tuscan, had the same general grammatical and lexical character which they have at present. The comparative immutability of the Tuscan is doubtless due to the fact that it became the standard written language of the Peninsula. Is there anything violently improbable or unreasonable in the supposition that this *lingua comune*, or some one or more of the other extant Italian dialects, was spoken twelve centuries earlier, in a form recognizable as substantially the same as that they now exhibit?

We are, indeed, not entitled to assume a fact as true because it is possible, or even, to a certain degree, probable ; and therefore, as we have already said, our author may justly be called upon for his proofs. Sir George Cornwall Lewis denies that there is any "evidence whatever" of the ancient existence of a *Romana rustica*, or *vulgaris*, "distinct in its forms or roots from the Latin." But what proof, in nature and amount, is the affirmant of the proposition bound to furnish? Unwritten lan-

guages leave no literary monuments, possess no formulated and recorded grammatical system. Hence the evidence which could exist on such a point, before the age of critical philology, would necessarily be very scanty. Still, *de non existentibus et de non apparentibus eadem est ratio*, and therefore some proof must be adduced by those who maintain the affirmative opinion. The nature of the proof, it will be admitted, is the same which would be required to establish to a stranger the existence of the modern Bolognese or Milanese; the amount reasonably demanded is less, not merely because of the lapse of time, and the notorious indifference of the Romans to all philologies except classical Latin and Greek, but because all linguistic presumption is in favor of the multiplication of dialects at early periods of European history.

Let us apply these tests to the question, Have there existed in Italy, since the birth of her modern literature, one or more popular, spoken, habitually unwritten dialects, "distinct in their forms or roots" from the *lingua comune*, or language of books, of journalism, of official life, of intercourse between native citizens of different provinces? Let us suppose a foreigner possessing just that portion of modern Italian literature which corresponds to the extant literature of Rome, and let his collection be as fragmentary and incomplete as is the body of Roman literature which has come down to us. What are the chances that he would find, in his reading, any proof that there is, or ever was, a distinct unwritten dialect popularly spoken by the citizens of Milan, or Bologna, or Venice, or Naples, or Turin? The *Secchia Rapita* would reveal to him the existence of the Bolognese, and among his odd volumes of Goldoni he might light upon a fragment of a comedy in Venetian. If he possessed the autobiography of Alfieri, he would learn that in the eighteenth century a *patois* called Piedmontese was spoken at Turin. The *Ricordi* of Massimo d'Azeglio, just now issued from the press, would inform him that this same *patois* is still current at that city. But D'Azeglio's style is as colloquial as that of Plautus, and, besides, there has lately been what the French call a *recrudescence* in the vitality of the *dialetto* at the old sub-Alpine capital. But how much knowledge of the grammatical or lexical character of those dialects could he

gather from such sources, and what actual acquaintance have European scholars generally, who know Italian only by the study of its literature in their own country, with the living *linguæ rusticæ* of the Peninsula? Scholars confined to such sources of information as we have supposed — and we have no better on ancient Italic philology — would be not at all better able to show the real being and character of the modern *linguæ rusticæ* than we are of the old.

It may help to the clearer understanding of the subject if we devote a little space to the consideration of the mutual relations between the spoken and the written languages of Italy, — a matter not easy of comprehension to American and English scholars, who use only one form of their native tongue. It is difficult for us to imagine a great poet, an elegant prose-writer, still more a fluent and correct speaker, habitually thinking, talking with refined friends and neighbors, “driving bargains,” and even “making love,” in a dialect absolutely without literary culture, and far more remote from the classic form of his native tongue than the language of Birdofredum Sawin is from the English of Macaulay. Yet such is the fact with all Italians excepting Tuscans, and even with them to a greater extent than foreigners usually suppose. Biondelli says: “To speak and write Italian, we must learn our own language by long and laborious study, almost as we master Latin and French; and in spite of the affinity between our dialects, . . . we are really obliged to translate our local speech into another tongue.” In a letter to the editor of *Il Borghini*, printed in the sixth number of that periodical, Pasquini observes: “To turn into Italian a Milanese sentence, the words and the forms must be, in great part, changed. It is not enough to correct the grammar, there must be actual translation.”

The observation of every foreigner resident in Italy will confirm these declarations to the fullest extent; and in Piedmont and some other provinces, speaking Italian, even with strangers, is avoided as an affectation, French being generally employed instead.

The great writers of the fourteenth century, Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and the chroniclers, adopted the vernacular Tuscan, and wrote as the world around them spoke. The reverence

entertained for those authors, all of whom acquired a great contemporaneous popularity, led to their too exclusive acceptance as models of style and diction, and prevented the written language from keeping up with the enrichment and spontaneous development of the vernacular, which was a natural and necessary consequence of the extension of commerce, of the freedom of thought and inquiry which revived for a time when the anti-Papal schism had diminished the authority of the Church, and of other circumstances which gave a new character to the Italian life of the succeeding century. Hence, while the language of books remained in a great degree stationary, the living speech of Tuscany, as well as of the rest of Italy, was undergoing considerable changes; and in the time of the Florentine Davanzati, three hundred years ago, the divergence between the word and the letter was already such as to justify the complaint of that excellent writer, that the authors of his time “hamstring the language, composing not in our own living tongue, but in the common Italian which is nowhere spoken, but is learned, like the dead languages, by the study of those Florentine writers whose works do not embrace the whole speech,” &c.

What authorizes us to affirm, what renders it so much as *prima facie* probable, that a similar relation did not exist between the written and the spoken tongues of even the Roman capital? The usual conversational language of the Italian Bourbons was Neapolitan; the royal family at Turin have always spoken Piedmontese; Milanese is the habitual vernacular of Manzoni; every Italian city has its theatres in which dramatic entertainments are constantly given *in dialetto*, — for this is modern Italian for *lingua rustica*, — and the Teatro Meneghino, for the native drama, is the favorite resort of the most refined society of the Lombard capital. These are all undoubted facts, and yet not one of them would be learned from the perusal of such Italian books as are commonly read in other countries. Hence it is fair to argue that the general silence of the Latin classical writers on this point does not even tend to show that the *lingua vulgaris* was not spoken in the palace of the Cæsars, — in fact, Quintilian tells us expressly that Augustus used the modern Italian form *calda* for *calida*;

that Livy's *patavinity* was anything more than simply an infusion of the idioms of the Paduan household dialect; or that the *fabulæ Atellanæ*, though called Oscan by the foreigner Strabo, were essentially different in diction from the comedy *in dialetto* of modern Italy. Even the conversational witticisms quoted by Cicero and Quintilian, though reported in classical Latin, may have been uttered in the vulgar tongue, for every one who has lived long in Italy has heard jokes, first pronounced in Piedmontese or Neapolitan, translated into good set Tuscan by the narrator, or even by the original author in repeating them.

The universal prevalence of the Latin language, in its classical form, throughout the Roman Empire, is very generally assumed, but by no means yet proved. Nobody doubts that it was the language of law, of literature, of the administrative action of the government, and that, like the modern Italian, it served as a common medium of communication between the citizens of different parts of the Peninsula who may have habitually spoken dialects unintelligible to each other. But where is the proof that it ever went further? It certainly did not extirpate Greek or Oscan at Pompeii, though the evidence of the numerous inscriptions hastily scratched or painted on the walls of that city undoubtedly shows that, of the three languages, Latin was the tongue most frequently written. But it does not prove that Latin had become the popular speech; for by just such evidence we might show that Tuscan is the vernacular of Bologna or Turin at this day. You see everywhere on the walls of these towns inscriptions like those at Pompeii, never *in dialetto*, but always in the *lingua comune*, which is certainly not the familiar dialect of either of them. The only difference between the mural writings of Pompeii and of modern provincial towns lies in the fact that paper and printing have in a great degree substituted perishable placards for the more permanent scratched and colored advertisements, electioneering appeals, and the like, at Pompeii.

Latin was long the official language, but it never became the spoken tongue, of Byzantium. The French conquerors of the Morea and Attica used French during their occupation of Greece. Ramon Muntaner declares that "the goodliest chiv-

alry in the world was that of the Morea; and they spoke as fair French as at Paris." But what impression did they make on the native speech? What effect did even the Avars and the Bulgarians, who permanently changed almost every geographical name in the Peloponnesus, produce upon Greek?

Lewis maintains that "the universal prevalence of the Latin language is proved by the use of the word Latin for language generally in old French and Italian." We draw just the contrary inference from the use of the word as we have met with it; for in most of the examples, especially the earlier ones known to us, Latin evidently means a foreign language. Thus, the birds are said to converse "in their Latin." Saracens, and other strangers are noticed as speaking "their Latin"; and the word *latiner*, afterwards corrupted to *latimer*, meant, not a fluent speaker, but always an interpreter.

Further, we are not well enough acquainted with the normal pronunciation of classical Latin to understand how far its orthography was phonographic. We know from Quintilian and other writers that it had, like French, silent letters, perhaps even syllables, the omission of which in speaking or reading would bring it much nearer to what the *lingua rustica* is supposed to have been, and consequently to modern Italian, than its mere spelling would authorize us to suppose. Suetonius observes that Augustus, like the first Napoleon, did not follow the conventional orthography, but spelt by the ear, writing *error commune* for *error communis*,—a remark which both proves that the *s* was silent, and establishes an exact identity, in this particular phrase at least, between the spoken Roman and the modern Italian dialect. Cantù collects in the eighth section of his paper numerous examples of the same sort, which tend strongly to confirm his views.

In the preceding remarks we have dwelt the longer on the argument from analogy, because neither the writer whom we are reviewing, nor, so far as we are aware, other investigators of the question, have availed themselves of it, and because it seems to us an entirely satisfactory refutation of the charge of absurdity and improbability which has been urged against Cantù's general proposition. It certainly shows that the co-existence of a written and of an unwritten dialect, the one

almost exclusively employed in literature, the other almost as exclusively in speech, is not a new thing in Italy, but a constant fact as far back as we can trace the history of her modern dialects. Hence the truth of the theory we are discussing is a question, not of speculative, philological probability, but of evidence in support of what may be considered a fair historical presumption.

Cantù's thesis, though it logically divides itself into two propositions, does not practically admit of a similar analysis in the citation of its proofs, because the testimony which establishes the ancient use of unclassical words and forms in popular speech shows, at the same time, in most cases, that those words and forms are substantially, if not identically, the same employed at this day in Italian. Who can doubt that the vulgarisms *scopare*, *stopa*, *sufolo*, *bellus*, *caballus*, are the same as the similar words now heard every day in Italy? In Ausonius we have *testa* for *caput*; *ruvido* in Pliny the elder; *fracidus* in Cato; *cribellare* in Palladius; *minare* (modern Italian *menare*, French *mener*) in Apuleius; *jornus* and *tonus* (Italian *giorno* and *tuono*) in Seneca; *grandire*, *beneque evenire* (Italian *ingrandire e venir bene*) in Cato. Festus says, *res minimi pretii, cum dicimus non hettæ te facio*; the Italians say, *non ti stimo un ette*. Quintilian condemns the adjective *possibilis* as hardly admissible, and complains that *due*, *tre*, *cinque*, *quatiordice*, were in common use. St. Jerome informs us that draught-horses were vulgarly called *burici* (Italian *borrico*); Suetonius, that Augustus deprived a Roman of the consular dignity for writing *ixi* (Italian *essi*) for *ipsi*; but, besides other solecisms already quoted, the Emperor himself was accustomed to use *baceolus* (Italian *bacello*) for *stultus*. In like manner, we find *granarium*, *jubilare*, *pansa*, *bassus*, *morsicare*, *anca*, *planuria*, *sanguisuga*, *majale*, *rasores*, *cloppus*, *parentes* in sense of *affines*, *pisinni* (Italian *piccini*, Spanish *pequeño*, or perhaps *pequeño niño*, negro *picanniny*) for *fili*, all carelessly used for the classical terms, or expressly condemned as rustic by the critics. The modern Tuscan peasants are much inclined to dock words, and they go so far as to say, *u' o a i*, *dove ho a ire*. The Roman rustics did the same, and asked for a loaf in the phrase, *da mi il pane*, which

is literal Italian for *da mihi illum panem*. Cicero, as Cantù observes, had no difficulty in understanding this expression, and never dreamed that it had been learned from the Germans or other "barbarians."

These are a random selection from the examples cited by our author, and but a small proportion of those which he has so industriously collected; and yet, few as they are, it would require a long search in modern Italian miscellaneous literature to light upon as many specimens of the vocabulary of the living local dialects.

Those who are familiar with the Vulgate are aware that it contains many words and phrases which do not occur in classical authors. Cantù cites several of these, and argues, with force, that as the Vulgate, as well as the earlier translations of the Scriptures, was prepared less for educated Romans, to whom Greek was so familiar that they scarcely required a Latin Bible, than for popular use, it is probable that its departures from classical propriety are adoptions of, or approximations to, the vernacular speech. The solecisms of the Vulgate correspond, in great part, to the idiom of the modern Romance languages; and we think the presumption that they were taken from the popular dialect is stronger than the probability that they were introduced into that dialect from the Latin Scriptures.

Urbicius, who wrote on the art of war near the close of the fifth century, furnishes a remarkable list of words of military command which correspond nearly with the modern idiom: *Silentio mundata implete; Non vos turbatis; Ordinem servate; Bandum sequite; Nemo dimittat bandum; Inimicos seque*. It is true that Urbicius was a comparatively late writer; but words of command are not often changed except with the introduction of new weapons. Soldiers are eminently conservative, and hence the technical phrases we have quoted are probably much older than the time of Urbicius.

The words apparently belonging to the *lingua rustica* collected by Cantù, Diez, and others, are certainly very far from forming a vocabulary complete enough for the uses of humble life; but they are quite as numerous as we have any right to expect to find in authors who sedulously avoided the use of

such words. If we come down a few centuries below the classical period, when the Roman culture had perished under the assaults of domestic corruption and foreign invasion, we find a very large number of vocables unknown to the better literature of Rome. It is certainly highly probable that a considerable part of the vocabulary of Du Cange had floated up from the bottom when the "mud-sills" of society were disturbed by violence and revolution. But Du Cange seldom cites authors older than the seventh century. Quicherat, in his *Ad-denda Lexicis Latinis*, has no less than seven thousand words collected from authors of the decline of Roman literature, and who wrote before the barbarous age had commenced. Every presumption is in favor of the supposition that most of these words properly belonged to the *Romana vulgaris*, and a great number of them are now extant in the Romance languages.

In the present condition of the science of language, philologists would attach more importance to evidence of grammatical than of lexical coincidences and discrepancies, as tending to show that the *lingua vulgaris* was essentially the same as the modern Italian, and essentially different from the classical Latin. The ancient writers naturally quote from the vernacular single words oftener than entire propositions, or even phrases, which show the grammatical construction. Hence, the evidence of a substantial inflexional or syntactical difference between the unwritten and the written dialects is neither in kind nor in amount all that could be desired to establish the affirmative of the proposition. There is, nevertheless, a considerable amount of testimony on this point. Cantù justly attaches importance to the declaration of Varro, that the [ancient] Latins employed only the ablative, which he appears to consider the stem, "declension having been introduced from convenience and necessity." Whether the Italian form of the noun was really taken from the ablative, is a disputed point, but at least it generally coincides with it; and in many instances expressions condemned by good Latin writers as vulgar show that the noun was used indeclinably in the ablative form.

Our author thus states the characteristic points in which Italian grammar differs from Latin:—

1. In indicating syntactical relations by prepositions instead of cases, or by substituting *pre*-positions for the *post*-positions of agglomerative languages.

2. In preceding the noun by the article, definite or indefinite.

3. In forming many tenses of the active, and all the tenses of the passive verb, by means of auxiliaries, that is, dropping the form expressive of *passion* in act (*legor*), and substituting that of *action* in effect (*ho letto*).

Numerous examples of these various forms of language are cited from ancient authors; and it must be allowed that they occur in the best writers, and often without any note of disapprobation. But they are most frequent in the Vulgate, and in other works not considered as authorities on questions of Latinity, and they are often condemned by ancient critics. Indeed, however doubtful we may be as to our competence to pronounce categorically upon nice questions of Latin construction, every one who has made that language, in its typical form, a familiar possession, feels that such combinations are foreign to the genius of the tongue, violations of symmetry in its architecture, or at least ungraceful colloquialisms. It seems highly probable that they are simply rustic forms, which by negligence or tolerance have been admitted into better society than they could justly lay claim to. These licenses are frequent in proportion to the more or less popular character of the works in which they occur. They are found oftenest in the comedy, in familiar letters, in the *Scriptores Rei Rusticæ*, in the Vulgate, in the works of the early Christian writers, in sepulchral and other private inscriptions, or in authors unknown to fame.

It is worth noticing, as affording some support to our author's theory, that the Umbrian — a language certainly allied to Latin — appears to use many nouns in an indeclinable ablative form, like the Italian. In the Eugubine tables we find *pane*, *capro*, *porco*, *bue*, *atro*, *ferina*, *sonito*, and even the modern adverb *poi* for *postquam*. The little we know of the other old Italic dialects points in the same direction.

In addition to all this testimony and much more of the same kind, — for we have offered but a *spicilegium* of the proofs, —

Cantù and other advocates of the same opinion cite a great multitude of passages from Roman literature, in which the existence of a distinct spoken dialect is more or less clearly asserted. In some cases these citations seem to refer to a speech almost radically diverse from the Latin ; but in many cases they are as fairly to be interpreted as referring merely to accidental vulgarisms become habitual, as is constantly happening in all languages.

Diez, whose authority on all questions relating to the structure and history of the Romance languages is extremely high, agrees with Cantù in tracing those dialects to the rustic or vulgar spoken Latin, but he does not believe the latter to have been anything more than a popular colloquial corruption of the classic tongue. We give his views in his own words : —

“ Six Romance languages claim our attention by their grammatical character or their literary significance ; — two eastern, Italian and Wallachian ; two southwestern, Spanish and Portuguese ; and two northwestern, Provençal and French. They all have their primary and principal source in the Latin. But they are derived, not from the Latin employed in literature, but, as has been often justly argued, from the Roman popular speech, which was used concurrently with classical Latin. Attempts have been made to prove the existence of such a popular dialect by the testimony of the ancients ; but its existence is a fact so little needing proof that we should rather be justified in requiring evidence to the contrary, as an exception to the general rule. We must, however, be careful not to understand by the term ‘ popular speech ’ anything more than is implied by it in other cases ; that is, the vulgar vernacular dialect of one and the same language, which consists in a negligent pronunciation of words, in an inclination to the resolution of grammatical forms, in the use of numerous expressions avoided by writers, and in special phrases and constructions. These and no other conclusions are warranted by the testimony and the specimens gathered from the works of ancient authors ; at most, we can only admit that the contrast between the dialect of popular discourse and that of literature, on the complete congelation of this latter, a little before the downfall of the Western Empire, manifested itself more conspicuously. If, then, the existence of a popular dialect, that is, of a vulgar form of speech, is, upon general grounds, certain, the derivation of the Romance dialects from this popular speech is not less certain, inasmuch as the written language — resting altogether on the past and cultivated only by the higher classes and by writers — admitted of no new development or

production, while the much more flexible vulgar tongue contained the germ and the susceptibility of a development imposed by time. When at a later period, in consequence of that great event, the German conquest, the ancient culture perished with the higher classes, the pure Latin died of itself. The popular dialect pursued its course the more rapidly, and became at last the fountain from which the Romance languages flowed, though in a form widely different from their original." — *Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen*, Vol. I. pp. 3, 4.

Diez, it will be seen, agrees with Cantù in tracing the Romance languages back to the popular dialect of Italy, but he denies to that dialect a lexical or grammatical character distinct from that of the Latin. In short, he holds the *lingua rustica*, of course, in all its different *patois*, to be not a collateral relative, but a direct descendant of the classical tongue, maimed, debased, corrupted by the clownish ignorance of those who spoke it.

This theory, which evidently supposes the Latin to have been at some ancient period the nearly universal language of the Italian people, appears to us to be destitute of historical support, and to be at the same time contrary to all sound presumption. The people of Italy were not all of one race, nor in the early ages of Roman history did they employ a common tongue. Doubtless there existed some local, nameless, and forgotten *patois*, of which, as they were never written, no traces have survived to us. Several of the native dialects, however, had been reduced to writing, and possessed at least a lapidary literature. If these languages were all eradicated by the speech of the Roman conquerors in the brief space between the foundation and the downfall of Rome, it is a fact unparalleled in history and entirely contrary to the ordinary course of nature. The agencies *de propaganda lingua* must have been infinitely less efficient in the rude, semi-barbarous days of republican Rome, than after the introduction of Christianity, and especially after the invention of printing. But how slow, even in our times, is the process of extirpating a local dialect, and substituting a central, common speech! The Germanic dialects are certainly all much more closely allied to the High-German, than Umbrian, Oscan, or Etruscan to Latin, and yet how persistently they hold out against the inroads of the Hoch-

Deutsch. Bretagne was subdued by Charlemagne a thousand years ago, but a Celtic tongue is still generally spoken in that province. Tuscan has been the sole written language of all Italy for at least five hundred years. It is the spoken dialect nowhere but in Tuscany; and Tuscan, Bolognese, Piedmontese, Neapolitan, Venetian, not to mention many other local forms, certainly differ in inflexion, syntax, and vocabulary more widely than Swedish and Danish, or than Spanish and Portuguese.

We have already remarked, that we have no proof that Latin ever supplanted the native Greek and Oscan at Pompeii. The modern Italian of books, though as universal at Naples as at Florence or Rome, has made little or no impression on the use of Neapolitan; and what evidence have we that Latin ever became any more a national vernacular, than the *lingua comune d'Italia* — the language of literature, of journalism, of the pulpit, of government — is to-day? It has never been supposed by any scholar that Bolognese, Venetian, Milanese, and the rest, are corruptions of Tuscan, or in any sense whatever derived from it. Some, indeed, have held, that they are all corruptions of classical Latin, modified by local influences. In our view, it is a far more probable opinion, that they are all descendants of different dialects as old as Latin itself, and that their common resemblances are due, first, to a remote pre-historical common origin, and secondly, to the modifying influence of Roman literature, law, and religion.

The local origin of the *lingua comune*, or Tuscan, is a vexed question. On the evidence of early poems written in that dialect by Sicilians, it has been argued that it was formed and reduced to writing in Sicily. But if so, how did it perish in that island, and how did it become the vernacular of Tuscany? Its universality in this latter province is stronger proof than any mere literary evidence can be that it is of strictly indigenous growth. If it were merely a corruption of Latin, it ought to have originated in Latium, where, if anywhere, Latin was emphatically the mother tongue of the whole people; whereas we have no proof whatever that Latin ever was a popularly spoken dialect in Etruria.

Admitting the *lingua rustica*, if not of Rome itself, at least

of Etruria and other more or less remote provinces, to have been a dialect grammatically distinguishable from classical Latin, it is easy to see that the continued existence of the latter through the Dark Ages as the only cultivated form, and, what is much more important, as the only possible means of either oral or written general communication between the population of different Italian provinces, and of universal religious instruction, must have exerted a great modifying and harmonizing influence on all the local *patois*. Hence we may fairly argue that, from the period of the extension of Roman sway beyond the boundaries of Latium to our own times, the provincial *linguæ rusticæ* of Italy have been converging toward, not diverging from, a common type.

We have thought that we should do a wrong to the author we are reviewing, and weaken an argument to the benefit of which he is entitled, by presenting a complete summary of his course of reasoning, or by introducing much of his body of evidence. We have preferred, therefore, to strengthen, by presenting a few independent considerations, the position taken by Cantù in a discussion which we hope scholars interested in the subject will pursue in his own pages. We have felt, too, that we should encumber and embarrass this brief argument by any examination of the applicability of this or that particular theory to the non-Italian Romance dialects. They each deserve a special, independent examination, and when philology shall have done for Spanish and Portuguese and Catalan, for Wallachian and Romantsch, what Cantù and his predecessors have done for Italian, we shall be better prepared for the formulation and acceptance of definite conclusions, than we can be with only our present means of knowledge. Hispano-Latin is a mine hitherto little wrought. Even Isidore has not been yet turned to the best possible account. The Latin texts of the *Aureum Opus Privilegiorum Regni Valentiaë*, of Capmany's *Memorias Historicas*, of the various collections of Aragonese legislation, and of the *España Sagrada*, contain numerous words unknown to Du Cange; and there yet exists in Spain and Portugal an immense mass of unedited mediæval Latin, which will doubtless yield an abundant harvest to future investigators.

In conclusion, although we are not prepared to say that

Cantù has irrefragably established his whole thesis, it seems to us that he has made out a very strong, if not a conclusive case, as concerns the question whether modern Italian is derived from a spoken or from the classical written language of ancient Italy. There is still room for debate whether the popular speech was, as Cantù supposes, a distinct dialect of Latin, related to that tongue only as Bolognese, for example, is allied to Tuscan ; or, as Diez maintains, merely a vulgar corruption of the language written by all, and spoken by the cultivated classes. In all events, the theory of Müller, which is equally applicable to either conclusion, is both sufficient and indispensable as an explanation of Germanic features and Germanic ingredients found in the Romance languages.

- ART. II. — 1. *Die laendliche Verfassung Ruzslands. Ihre Entwicklungen und ihre Feststellung in der Gesetzgebung von 1861.* Von AUGUST FREIHERRN VON HAXTHAUSEN. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. 1866.
2. *Les Institutions de la Russie depuis les Réformes de l'Empereur Alexandre II.* Par M. I.-H. SCHNITZLER. Paris: V° Berger-Levrault et Fils. 1866.
3. *Sketches of Russian Life before and during the Emancipation of the Serfs.* Edited by HENRY MORLEY, Professor of English Literature in University College, London. London: Chapman and Hall. Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott & Co. 1866.
4. *Eastern Europe and Western Asia. Political and Social Sketches of Russia, Greece, and Syria in 1861-2-3.* By HENRY ARTHUR TILLEY. London: Longman, Green, Roberts, and Green. 1864.

ALMOST unnoticed amid the excitement of our threatening calamities came the report, in March, 1861, that Russia had proclaimed emancipation to the serfs within her borders. At that time no one thought of connecting it with our own experience. Two years later our proclamation had gone forth ; another two years, and it had been ratified by the successful